



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,278	10/14/1999	BRADLEY S. TEMPLETON		5956
7590 02/29/2008				
BRADLEY S. TEMPLETON 1113 LOCHINVAR AVENUE SUNNYVALE, CA 94087-5102				
EXAMINER				
VAN DOREN, BETH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3623				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/29/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/416,278

**Applicant(s)**

TEMPLETON, BRADLEY S.

**Examiner**

BETH VAN DOREN

**Art Unit**

3623

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,54-57 and 72-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,54-57 and 72-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a Final Office Action in response to communications received 12/06/2007. Claims 1, 4, 6, 78, 83, and 90-91 have been amended. Claims 92-96 have been added. Claims 1, 3-8, 54-57, and 72-96 are pending.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendments to claim 90 are sufficient to overcome the claim objections set forth in the previous office action.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with regards to Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (1) Gisby et al does not teach or suggest "if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requester becomes available" and, with respect to claim 1, Examiner stated that a possible status includes not available, and (2) Gisby et al does not teach or suggest "initiating the second real-time meeting prior to the first real-time meeting if the second requester becomes available before the first requester".

In response to argument (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner points out that claim 88 recites a method comprising the steps of "if the requester is available, then initiating the first real-time meeting" and "if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requestor becomes available". Therefore, if the first "if" condition in the claim of the requester being available, then the other "if" statement of the requester not being available would not occur within the scope of the claim. See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-67, column 5, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 35-50, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, wherein both parties are available

and the meeting is initiated based on the availability and priority of the requester and the availability of the agent. Thus, since the requester is available, the limitation “if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requestor becomes available” will not occur.

In response to argument (2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gisby teaches receiving a second request for a second real-time meeting between a second requestor and the first target, wherein the second request is received after the first request. The second real-time meeting is initiated prior to the first real-time meeting if the second requester becomes available before the first requester. See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein a second request for an agent is received, the request is queued, and wherein a queue of callers requesting an agent is formed. There is one agent that takes multiple calls from the queue and thus the agent is the common party. Specifically, the requests are queued in terms of priority and thus, when the second request has a higher priority, it is placed in queue ahead of the first request. Thus, the second requester is available to the common party (the target) before the first requestor based on the prioritized queue.

4. Applicant’s arguments with regards to Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146) and Yacenda et al. (U.S. 5,515,426) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (3) Gisby et al does not teach or suggest the availability status of the caller, and Applicant and Examiner disagree as to the interpretation of the term, (4) Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. do not teach or suggest receiving by the decider system an availability status of R-A, where a possible availability status includes not available, (5) the combination of Gisby et al.

and Yacenda et al. would not be successful, and therefore the combination would not be obvious (pages 19-20 of the remarks) -Yacenda et al. requires an underlying PBX system, which would not combine successfully with Gisby et al., (6) as per claim 3, Gisby et al. does not teach or suggest that the status information is determined by polling (a system of the target is polled to determine the availability), and poll has a much more specific meaning than survey (7) as per claim 55, the prior art does not teach or suggest the availability status being one of in, out, and unknown, (8) as per claim 78, Gisby et al. does not teach or suggest that a caller is a party to more than one request, (9) as per claim 84, that even if the examiner's official notice were true, this does not teach the limitations of claim 84 because Gisby et al. does not teach a system in which a caller can specify a particular one of these agents.

In response to argument (3), the term availability, in its broadest reasonable interpretation, is ready for use or service. Status, in its broadest reasonable interpretation, can mean either position in relation to others or a stat or condition. Therefore, availability status is the readiness of a requester (in terms of their condition). This readiness can be their position in relation to others. This readiness can also include the condition of available or not available. This is a consistent interpretation based on the art rejection below. Gisby et al. discloses that the user is connected to the system and in queue based on their priority (See column 5, lines 20-40 and 45-62, column 6, lines 35-50, and column 7, lines 1-10 and 32-52). Therefore, the user has the status of available (able to be connected with) and positioned in the queue based on the user's priority. The requester can be connected with based on this status, where the user's status includes the conditions of position in queue and availability indicating available. Examiner

points out that she did not rely on Gisby to teach the condition of not available, as asserted become with respect to claim 1. Rather, Yacenda et al. was relied upon to teach this limitation.

In response to argument (4), Gisby et al. teaches receiving by the decider system an availability status of R-A, where a possible availability status includes the requester's position in queue and that the requester is on the line. Examiner asserted Gisby et al. does not expressly disclose that a possible availability status of the requester R-A or R-B includes not available. Yacenda et al. discloses that a requester disconnects from the system, and thus is unavailable because he/she is no longer in the queue waiting to connect with the second party. See figures 24 and 24B, column 17, line 55-column 18, line 5, and column 19, lines 32-55, wherein a callback function is indicated, the party to be called back (the requester) is unavailable, and the meeting does not occur until both parties are available. Therefore, Yacenda et al. does teach and suggest that the current status of a user is unavailable at the point the target becomes available, and therefore based on this current unavailability, the callback function must be utilized.

In response to argument (5), examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner utilized Yacenda et al. to teach the concept that a possible availability status of the requester R-A or R-B includes not available. Examiner did not really on Yacenda et al. to disclose the underlying system on which the method operates. Yacenda et al. discloses that a requester disconnects from the system, and thus is unavailable because he/she is no longer in the queue waiting to connect with the second party. Therefore, there is reasonable expectation of success that if a caller hangs up from the call center of Gisby et al. based on the teachings of Yacenda et al. that the caller will be viewed as unavailable to the agent. Applicant has not responded to why Examiner's arguments would not be the case, and therefore Examiner maintains her assertion. Further, examiner notes

that, in the claims, the user being unavailable results in no real-time meeting. There are no limitations that expressly state that the unavailable requestor is continually reviewed to determine if the user's status goes from unavailable to available. Thus, the user hanging up, such as in Yacenda et al., would result in no meeting, consistent with the claims.

In response to argument (6), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner maintains that the term poll means to survey in the broadest reasonable interpretation of the term, where survey means to check, assess, or examines. Therefore, claim 3 recites that the system is surveyed, checked, or examined to determine the availability of the target. The claim contains no recitation of any specific hardware, software, or functionality utilized to perform such polling. Gisby et al. teaches an application that monitors or reviews or assesses or surveys real-time information concerning the availability status of the agents in column 5, lines 5-11.

In response to argument (7), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Availability status is discussed above with respect to argument (3). Gisby et al. teaches that the availability status of one of the requesters is displayed via pop-up to the target. See column 6, lines 45-60, column 8, lines 25-45, wherein the target receives a pop-up concerning the requester). The "availability status is one of in, out, or unknown". Examiner notes that only one of the statuses is required by the claim. Gisby et al. specifically discloses that the requester is present/available and further discusses status information about a logged in agent. See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in. See also column 7, lines 1-10 and 30-57, which discusses further status information about a logged in agent.

In response to argument (8), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner does not agree that the limitations of claim 78 require that a caller is a party to more than one request. Rather,

to the contrary, the claim asserts that the requester R-A or R-B is a non-common requester. Further, claim 78 states “wherein a non-common requester R-A or R-B is party to another, distinct meeting request”. Thus, the claim states that the requests of R-A and R-B are separate and distinct. See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein a second request for an agent is received, the request is queued, and wherein a queue of callers requesting an agent is formed. Thus, R-A and R-B are separately in the queue.

In response to argument (8), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 84 recites, dependant from claim 1, “wherein the target is a specific individual selected by the requester”. First, examiner notes that it is unclear specially to which requester the claim is referring. Further, it is not clear where in claim 1 the request occurs or how it impacts the recited method, beyond that in step 1 that the request of R-A would be for a specific T-A, and the meeting would be queued as such (or in step 6 that the request of R-B would be for a specific T-B, and the meeting would be queued as such). Examiner agrees with Applicant that Gisby et al. does not teach specifying a specific target. However, it is old and well known in the telephone art for a calling party to request a specific individual when placing a call to a second organization, such as when a person calls a company and asks to speak with a certain manager. For example, when one calls any automated call center, one can dial a specific extension for a known party and then be queued, or can simply choose a department to route the call to. This, in combination with the teachings of Gisby et al., would meet the claim limitations of claim 84.



5. Applicant's arguments with regards to Gisby et al., Yacenda et al., and Vaios (U.S. 6,272,216) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that (10) with respect to claim 56, the combination of Gisby et al. and Vaios does not teach or suggest the claim because in Vaios it is known which specific target the requestor may eventually be connected to, whereas in Gisby et al. it is not, (11) with respect to claim 83, none of the prior art teaches that a common party participates in both meetings.

In response to argument (10), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 56 recites that an availability status of the target T-A is displayed on the requester system, along with an indication that the requestor has requested a meeting with the target. In claim 56, it is not required that the user has specified a specific target, but rather in the broadest reasonable interpretation the user could merely have been queued with the target. Gisby et al. teaches an availability status of the target T-A in at least column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-54, column 5, lines 5-10, column 6, lines 37-44, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, which discusses availability. Gisby et al. specifically discloses that the requestor is present/available and further discusses status information about a logged in agent. See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in. See also column 7, lines 1-10 and 30-57, which discusses further status information about a logged in agent. Examiner notes that in Gisby et al., the user is queued with a specific target known by the system, whether or not the requestor be aware of this target.

Vaios teaches displaying an availability status of the target T-A on the requester system, along with an indication that the requestor has requested a meeting with the target. See abstract, figure 2, column 4, lines 8-15, 35-58, column 5, lines 19-29, 38-39, and 53-67, where aios expressly discloses the requester side of these systems, wherein the requester may view status

and other information about agents. Thus, the combination of the teachings of Vaios with the teachings of Gisby et al. meets the limitations of claim 56,

In response to argument (11), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vaios teaches that the requester has two or more real-time meetings in the queue, and thus is a common party in the multiple meetings. See abstract, column 4, lines 8-15, 43-58, column 5, lines 19-29 and 53-56, of Vaios which teaches multiple requests to multiple agents are queued by the same requester system. Examiner is not clear how this does not meet the limitations of claim 83, which requires the same requestor to be a party to multiple meetings (M-A and M-B).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 92 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 92 recites “wherein the non-common requester R-A or R-B that is party to another distinct meeting request is a target in that meeting request”. It is unclear how this another, distinct meeting functionally interrelates with and effects the method steps of claim 1. Clarification is required.

Claim 96 recites the limitation “the phone”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Clarification is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

9. Claims 88-89 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146).

As per claim 88, Gisby et al. teaches a method comprising:

transmitting or receiving a first request for a first real-time meeting between a requester and a first target, the requester and the first target being individuals (See figures 2 and 3, column 2, lines 33-39, column 3, lines 1-14, wherein incoming calls are received because a caller needs a meeting with a target agent));

determining that the first target is unavailable, using a computing system (See column 3, lines 1-5, column 4, lines 55-64, column 5, lines 5-10, column 6, lines 37-44, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, which discusses availability);

waiting until the first target changes from being unavailable to being available (See figures 2-3, column 5, lines 20-40, wherein the request is queued. See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-67, column 5, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 35-50, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, wherein when the target is available, the meeting can be initiated);

when the first target is available, determining if the requester is available (See column 5, lines 20-40 and 45-62, column 6, lines 35-50, and column 7, lines 1-10 and 32-52, wherein the availability status of R-A (the requester) is based on priority and thus the requester can be gotten based on this status);

if the requester is available, then initiating the first real-time meeting (See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-67, column 5, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 35-50, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, wherein both parties are available and the meeting is initiated based on the availability and priority of the requester and the availability of the agent).

Examiner notes that the limitation “if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requestor becomes available” does not occur in methods where the requester is available in the previous limitations. Therefore, since Gisby et al. teaches that the requester is available, the limitation “if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requestor becomes available” is not required.

As per claim 89, claim 89 is directed to and further limits the limitation “if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requestor becomes available” of claim 88. Examiner notes that the limitation “if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requestor becomes available” does not occur in methods where the requester is available in the previous

limitations. Therefore, since Gisby et al. teaches that the requester is available, the limitation "if the requester is unavailable, then waiting until a time the requester becomes available" is not required, and therefore the limitations of claim 89 further do not occur.

As per claim 91, Gisby et al. teaches transmitting or receiving a second request for a second real-time meeting between a second requestor and the first target, the second request being transmitted or received between a time the first request is transmitted or received and a time the first real-time meeting is initiated and initiating the second real-time meeting prior to the first real-time meeting if the second requester becomes available before the first requester (See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein a second request for an agent is received, the request is queued, and wherein a queue of callers requesting an agent is formed. There is one agent that takes multiple calls from the queue and thus the agent is the common party).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 3-8, 54-55, 72-79, 81-82, 84-85, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146) in view of Yacenda et al. (U.S. 5,515,426).

As per claim 1, Gisby et al. teaches a computer-implemented method for the intermediation of real time meetings, comprising:

receiving an indication by a requester system that a requester (R-A) wants to request a real-time meeting M-A with a target T-A (See figures 2 and 3, column 2, lines 33-39, column 3, lines 1-14, wherein incoming calls are received because a caller needs a meeting with a target agent);

sending to a decider system (D) a request to conduct a real time meeting M-A (See figures 2 and 3, column 5, lines 1-20 and 40-55, wherein a system receives the request for the meeting and queues the request);

queuing the request for the meeting M-A by the decider system (See figures 2-3, column 5, lines 20-40, wherein the request is queued);

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of T-A (See column 3, lines 1-5, column 4, lines 55-54, column 5, lines 5-10, column 6, lines 37-44, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, which discusses availability);

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of R-A (See column 5, lines 20-40 and 45-62, column 6, lines 35-50, and column 7, lines 1-10 and 32-52, wherein the availability status of R-A (the requester) is based on priority and thus the requester can be gotten based on this status);

receiving an indication by the requester system that a requester (R-B) wants to request a real-time meeting M-B with target T-B, the meeting M-B to be disjoint in time with the meeting M-A; and such that one of the parties to M-A (R-A or T-A), known as the 'common party' is also the same as one of the parties to M-B (R-B or T-B) and thus there are only three distinct parties, the decider D being associated with the common party (See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein a second

request for an agent is received, the request is queued, and wherein a queue of callers requesting an agent is formed. There is one agent that takes multiple calls from the queue and thus the agent is the common party);

sending to the decider system (D) a request to conduct a real time meeting M-B (See figures 2 and 3, column 5, lines 1-20 and 40-55, wherein a system receives the request for the meeting and queues the request);

queuing the request for the meeting M-B by the decider system, such that requests for at least two distinct meetings, disjoint in time are placed in the queue, so that multiple pending real time meetings for the common party are in the queue at the same time (See figures 2-3, column 5, lines 20-40, wherein the request is queued, and wherein a queue of callers requesting an agent is formed);

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of target T-B (See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-54, column 5, lines 5-10, column 6, lines 37-44, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, which discusses availability);

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of the requester R-B (See column 5, lines 20-40 and 45-62, column 6, lines 35-50, and column 7, lines 1-10 and 32-52, wherein the availability status of R-A (the requester) is based on priority and thus the requester can be gotten based on this status);

initiating, by the decider, one of the two meetings M-A and M-B by connecting the common party and the other party to that meeting when the common party and that other party are mutually available (See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-67, column 5, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 35-50, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, wherein both parties are available and the

meeting is initiated based on the availability and priority of the requester and the availability of the agent); and

dequeuing the request for a meeting (See at least column 5, lines 1-10, column 8, lines 25-30, wherein it is inherent that the call finishes and that the agent moves to the next requestor in the queue).

However, Gisby et al. does not expressly disclose that a possible availability status of the requester R-A or R-B includes not available.

Yacenda et al. discloses that the requestor (who called an unavailable target party) leaves his/her number for callback and then when the target party becomes available, the requestor is no longer available (and thus his/her status is unavailable) (See figures 24 and 24B, column 17, line 55-column 18, line 5, and column 19, lines 32-55, wherein a callback function is indicated, the party to be called back (the requester) is unavailable, and the meeting does not occur until both parties are available).

Both Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. disclose systems teach telephone functions for connecting a call requester (calling party) and a call target. Gisby et al. specifically discloses systems where requesters are queued when targets are busy. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the call back function of Yacenda et al. in the system of Gisby et al. in order to more efficiently facilitate calls between users by eliminating "phone tag" situations and causing a user to be on hold for long periods of time.



As per claim 3, Gisby et al. teaches wherein a system of the target T-A is polled to determine the availability of target T-A (See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in and busy).

As per claim 4, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the system of the target T-A pushes the availability status of target T-A to the decider system (See column 5, lines 5-11, column 7, lines 1-15 and 30-50, wherein the system knows if the target is busy based on status information established by the target).

As per claim 5, Gisby et al. teaches wherein a system of a party is polled to determine the party's availability (See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in and busy).

As per claim 6, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the system of a party pushes the party's availability status to the decider system (See column 5, lines 5-11, column 7, lines 1-15 and 30-50, wherein the system knows if the target is busy based on status information established by the target).

As per claim 7, Gisby et al. teaches wherein mutual availability is determined by checking the availability of one of the target/requester pairs T-A/R-A or T-B/R-B and the target (See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in and busy or available. Further, see column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-67, column 5, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 35-50, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, which discusses availability and priority of the requester).

As per claim 8, Gisby et al. teaches wherein a request is sent to a plurality of targets and mutual availability is determined when the requester and one of the plurality of targets is

available (See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-67, column 5, lines 35-40, column 6, lines 35-50, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, wherein both parties are available and the meeting is initiated based on the availability and priority of the requester and the availability of the agent).

As per claim 54, Gisby et al. teaches displaying the availability status of one of the requesters R-A and R-B on the target system, along with an indication that one of the requesters R-A and R-B has requested a meeting (See column 6, lines 45-60, column 8, lines 25-45, wherein the target receives a pop-up concerning the requester).

As per claim 55, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the availability status is one of in, out, and unknown (See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in. See also column 7, lines 1-10 and 30-57, which discusses further status information about a logged in agent).

As per claim 72, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the decider system a part of the system of the common party for whom it is responsible, and wherein the decider already knows the status of the common party for which it is responsible (The common party is construed as the agent. See figures 2 and 3, column 5, lines 1-20 and 40-55, which discuss the system of the agent(s). See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in. See also column 7, lines 1-10 and 30-57, which discusses further status information about a logged in agent).

As per claim 73, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the decider system chooses to activate one of two real time meetings, where the parties for both meetings are available based on priority information provided by either party (See figure 3, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-55, column 7, lines 1-9 and 30-50, wherein availability is based on priority of the requester) or the

order in time in which the requests were made (See figure 2, column 4, line 54-column 3, line 11, which discusses FIFO).

As per claim 74, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the decider system chooses to activate one of two real time meetings, where the parties for both meetings are available, based on ranking information including manual ranking through a user interface presented to the common party (See column 6, lines 45-60, column 8, lines 25-45, wherein the target receives a pop-up concerning the requester and has the ability to bump the current call or finish the current call).

As per claim 75, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the decider system chooses to activate one of two real time meetings, where the parties for both meetings are available, based on priority information provided by either party (See figure 3, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-55, column 7, lines 1-9 and 30-50, wherein availability is based on priority of the requester).

As per claim 76, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the decider system chooses to activate one of two real time meetings, where the parties for both meetings are available, based on the order in time in which the requests were made (See figure 2, column 4, line 54-column 3, line 11, which discusses FIFO).

As per claim 77, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the decider system chooses to activate one of two real time meetings, where the parties for both meetings are available, based on relationship information about the parties based on party input or past history (see column 5, lines 60-67, wherein a customer database is used).

As per claim 78, Gisby et al. teaches wherein a non-common requester R-A or R-B is party to another, distinct meeting request (See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein a second request for an

agent is received, the request is queued, and wherein a queue of callers requesting an agent is formed).

As per claim 79, Gisby et al. teaches wherein a non-common target is party to another distinct meeting request (See figures 2-3, wherein there is a second agent with separate call handling).

As per claim 81, Gisby et al. teaches wherein if all parties become available at once, only one of the meetings M-A and M-B will occur immediately and the other meeting will remain queued (See figure 3, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-55, column 7, lines 1-9 and 30-50, wherein availability is based on priority of the requester, and thus the meeting with the higher priority will occur and the once with lesser priority will remain in the queue).

As per claim 82, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the common party is the target T-A and T-B (See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein there is one agent that takes multiple calls from the queue and thus the agent is the common party).

As per claim 84, neither Gisby et al. nor Yacenda et al. expressly disclose that the target is a specific individual selected by the requestor.

Both Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. disclose systems teach telephone functions for connecting a call requester (calling party) and a call target. Gisby et al. specifically discloses systems where requesters are queued when targets are busy. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in the telephone art for a calling party to request a specific individual when placing a call to a second organization, such as when a person calls a company and asks to speak with a certain manager. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to include requesting a certain target in the system of Gisby et al. in order to more efficiently facilitate calls between users by allowing a user to specifically reach the party he/she set out to call.

As per claim 85, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the target is a specific individual (See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein the target is an agent).

As per claim 87, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the target is any one of a group of targets (See figures 2-3, column 3, lines 1-20, column 5, lines 20-40, column 6, lines 35-45, column 7, lines 1-15 and 35-50, wherein there is one agent that takes multiple calls from the queue and thus the agent is the common party. There are multiple agents at the call center).

12. Claims 56-57 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146) in view of Yacenda et al. (U.S. 5,515,426) and in further view of Vaios (U.S. 6,272,216).

As per claim 56, Gisby et al. teaches an availability status of the target T-A (See column 3, lines 1-15, column 4, lines 55-54, column 5, lines 5-10, column 6, lines 37-44, column 7, lines 1-20 and 39-55, which discusses availability). However, neither Gisby et al. does nor Yacenda et al. expressly disclose displaying an availability status of the target T-A on the requester system, along with an indication that the requestor has requested a meeting with the target.

Vaios teaches displaying an availability status of the target T-A on the requester system, along with an indication that the requestor has requested a meeting with the target (See abstract, figure 2, column 4, lines 8-15, 35-58, column 5, lines 19-29, 38-39, and 53-67).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vaios disclose systems that connect requesters to agents using queuing methods. Vaios expressly discloses the requester side of these systems, wherein the requester may view status and other information about agents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester system to view availability data and meeting requests by the requester in order to more efficiently let the requester gain service in a more timely manner and to allow the requester to have greater control over the handling and routing of their calls. See column 1, lines 23-25 and column 4, lines 43-58 of Vaios.

As per claim 57, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the availability status is one of in, out, and unknown (See column 5, lines 5-11, wherein the system knows if the target is logged in. See also column 7, lines 1-10 and 30-57, which discusses further status information about a logged in agent).

As per claim 80, Gisby et al. teaches wherein the target has two or more real-time meetings in the queue (See figures 2-3, column 5, lines 20-40). However, neither Gisby et al. nor Yacenda et al. expressly disclose that the requester has two or more real-time meetings in the queue.

Vaios teaches that the requester has two or more real-time meetings in the queue (See abstract, column 4, lines 8-15, 43-58, column 5, lines 19-29 and 53-56, wherein multiple requests to multiple agents are queued by the same requester system).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vaios disclose systems

that connect requesters to agents using queuing methods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester system to create a queue of outgoing calls while waiting for an agent in order to more efficiently let the requester gain service in a more timely manner and to allow the requester to have greater control over the handling and routing of their calls. See column 1, lines 23-25 and column 4, lines 43-58 of Vaios.

13. Claims 83, 86, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146) in view of Vaios (U.S. 6,272,216).

As per claims 83 and 86, Gisby et al. does not expressly disclose that the common party is the requestor R-A and R-B and the common party participates in both of the meetings M-A and M-B.

Vaios teaches that the requester has two or more real-time meetings in the queue, and thus is the common party in both of the meetings (See abstract, column 4, lines 8-15, 43-58, column 5, lines 19-29 and 53-56, wherein multiple requests to multiple agents are queued by the same requester system).

Both Gisby et al. and Vaios disclose systems that connect requesters to agents using queuing methods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester system to create a queue of outgoing calls while waiting for an agent in order to more efficiently let the requester gain service in a more timely manner and to

allow the requester to have greater control over the handling and routing of their calls. See column 1, lines 23-25 and column 4, lines 43-58 of Vaios.

As per claim 90, Gisby et al. does not expressly disclose and Vaios discloses transmitting or receiving a second request for a second real-time meeting between the first requester and a second target, the second request being transmitted or received between a time the first request is transmitted or received and a time the first real-time meeting is initiated; and initiating the second real-time meeting prior to the first real-time meeting if the second target becomes available before the first target (See abstract, column 4, lines 8-15, 43-58, column 5, lines 19-29 and 53-56, wherein multiple requests to multiple agents are queued by the same requester system).

Both Gisby et al. and Vaios disclose systems that connect requesters to agents using queuing methods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester system to create a queue of outgoing calls while waiting for an agent in order to more efficiently let the requester gain service in a more timely manner and to allow the requester to have greater control over the handling and routing of their calls. See column 1, lines 23-25 and column 4, lines 43-58 of Vaios.

14. Claims 92-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gisby et al. (U.S. 6,044,146) in view of Yacenda et al. (U.S. 5,515,426) and in further view of Vardi et al. (U.S. 6,389,127).

As per claim 92, neither Gisby et al. nor Yacenda expressly disclose and Vardi et al. discloses wherein the non-common requester R-A or R-B that is party to another distinct meeting



request is a target in that meeting request (See column 7, line 50-column 8, line 5, wherein the requester of the conference becomes the target of a callback or someone to be conferenced in).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vardi et al. disclose systems that connect requesters to targets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester to be a target in another meeting request in order to allow the requester to have greater control over the handling and routing of their calls.

As per claim 93, Gisby et al. does not expressly disclose that the requestor R-A changes states from not available to available, while waiting for the real-time meeting M-A.

Yacenda et al. discloses that the requestor (who called an unavailable target party) leaves his/her number for callback and then when the target party becomes available, the requestor is no longer available (and thus his/her status is unavailable) (See figures 24 and 24B, column 17, line 55-column 18, line 5, and column 19, lines 32-55, wherein a callback function is indicated, the party to be called back (the requester) is unavailable, and the meeting does not occur until both parties are available). However, Yacenda et al. does not expressly discuss states changing from not available to available while waiting.

Vardi et al. discloses the state of parties changing while waiting for a meeting, beginning with being unavailable, and ending available (See column 7, line 50-column 8, line 5, wherein the conference member is unavailable and becomes available).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vardi et al. disclose

systems that connect requesters to targets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester to change states (and perform other tasks) while waiting for a meeting in order to allow the requester to more efficiently use his time.

As per claim 94, neither Gisby et al. nor Yacenda expressly disclose and Vardi et al. discloses teaches the requestor R-A participates in another distinct real-time meeting while waiting for the real-time meeting M-A (See column 7, line 50-column 8, line 5, wherein the requestor involves himself in another meeting while waiting for the other target to conference in).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vardi et al. disclose systems that connect requesters to targets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also allow the requester to change states (and perform other tasks) while waiting for a meeting in order to allow the requester to more efficiently use his time.

As per claim 95, neither Gisby et al. nor Yacenda expressly disclose and Vardi et al. teaches wherein the requester R-A becomes available when the requestor R-A terminates a call (See at least column 7, line 50-column 8, line 5, wherein availability is based on termination of calls and where callback is initiated when a line is available).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vardi et al. disclose systems that connect requesters to targets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to indicate availability by the termination of a call in order to more efficiently connect calls based on the actual availability of the parties to be involved.

As per claim 96, neither Gisby et al. nor Yacenda expressly disclose and Vardi et al. teaches wherein the requester R-A and target T-A are both available when they are both off of the phone (See at least column 7, line 50-column 8, line 5, wherein availability is based on termination of calls and where a user is available when not on the phone (i.e. they are off the phone).

Gisby et al. and Yacenda et al. are in analogous art and it is obvious to combine these references for the reasons set forth above. Further, both Gisby et al. and Vardi et al. disclose systems that connect requesters to targets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to indicate availability by the users not being on the in order to more efficiently connect calls based on the actual availability of the parties to be involved.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BETH VAN DOREN whose telephone number is (571)272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. V.D./  
February 13, 2008

/Beth Van Doren/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623